

CHAPLAINCY MANAGEMENT: PRESENT AND FUTURE

BY

CH (LTC) WILLIAM L. THOMAS

IN FULFILLMENT OF

WRITING REQUIREMENT FOR SUPCOURSE NUMBER 85/9

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER                                            | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION.....                               | 1    |
| Purpose of the paper.....                          | 1    |
| Scope of the paper.....                            | 1    |
| Limitations of the paper.....                      | 1    |
| II. CONTRASTING TWO SYSTEMS OF MANAGEMENT.....     | 2    |
| Management by Objectives and Results.....          | 2    |
| Management by Function.....                        | 2    |
| Chaplaincy evaluation under each system.....       | 3    |
| Present mission of Army Chaplaincy.....            | 3    |
| Army Chaplaincy and Army Mission harmonized....    | 4    |
| III. AN ANECDOTE.....                              | 5    |
| MEO and MEF in conflict.....                       | 5    |
| Conflict resolved.....                             | 6    |
| IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 6    |
| Present system of Chaplaincy management.....       | 6    |
| Army's mission vs. Chaplaincy mission.....         | 6    |
| Both management systems being utilized.....        | 7    |
| Utilizing MEO at all levels of Chaplaincy.....     | 7    |
| V. FOOTNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.....                 | 8    |

## I. INTRODUCTION

This paper will seek to do three things; First, contrast the present system of Chaplaincy Management by Function with the system of Chaplaincy Management by Objectives.

Secondly, it will seek to answer the following questions; Does a Chaplaincy Management System by Function address and meet the overall mission of the Army? Does Management by Function meet only the internal needs of the Army? What would be the results if Chaplains used Management by Objectives routinely at the lowest levels of the Chaplaincy? And, would Management by Objectives result in a better utilization of Chaplains?

The Writer of this paper realizes that each of the above questions could be the sole basis of this paper. However, no attempt will be made to deal definitively with these four questions.

Finally, this paper will seek to draw some conclusions and make a couple of recommendations.

## II. CONTRASTING TWO SYSTEMS OF MANAGEMENT

Under former Chief of Army Chaplains, Major General Orris E. Kelly, a system of Chaplaincy Management called, Management by Objectives and Results was instituted in 1974.<sup>1</sup>

Management by Objectives and Results, or MBO for short, is a philosophy of management which has three basic ideas;<sup>2</sup>

1. Think about the organization in terms of it's overall mission and purpose.
2. Reduce these purposes to accomplishable and measurable goals.
3. Key individuals within the organization write objectives as to how they are going to accomplish these goals.

So far, this new system of MBO has been used on a selective basis within the Army Chaplaincy. For the most part the present system of management of the Army Chaplaincy is Management by Function.

Management by Function is a system of management that focuses on roles and tasks within an organization, plus the many functional relationships.<sup>3</sup> When applied to the Chaplaincy, Management by Function focuses on the roles, functions, and relationships of the Chaplain within the organization.

It would appear that in today's Army Chaplains have become Role Specialists. By this I mean that the purpose, function, and role of the Chaplain is rather narrowly defined and proscribed by Army Regulation, Field Manual, Branch Guideline, and Individual Commander.

These proscriptions circumscribe the fulfillment of certain Chaplain tasks and roles that are designed to meet the internal needs and functions of the institution more than it's overall mission.<sup>4</sup>

The overall mission of the Army has always been to be ready to fight and destroy the enemy if committed to combat. It would seem then that at some point a system of Chaplaincy Management must address this basic or overall missional need of the organization.

However, under the present system of Chaplaincy Management there appears to be no way to evaluate what the Chaplain is doing by how well it enables the Army to accomplish this basic mission.

Instead, the Chaplain has tended to be evaluated on how well he functions in the performance of his role.

Under a management by objectives system the Chaplain would be evaluated differently. He would be evaluated on how well his ministry contributes to the overall mission of the Army.

Under the present system of Management by Function the Chaplain has no real ownership of ministry and program. It belongs to his Commander. The Chaplain thus avoids any ultimate accountability. His Commander is held accountable.

Under Management by Objectives the Chaplain would have ownership of ministry and programs, and also be held accountable. This would permit a more accurate assessment of the Chaplain's contribution to the basic mission of the Army.

The present mission of the Army Chaplaincy appears more in line with an MBF than with an MBO system. The present mission of the Army

Chaplaincy has been stated as, "to bring men to God, and God to men."

Such a general statement of mission lends itself to a non-goal oriented ministry such as in a Management by Function system. However, if this missional goal of the Chaplaincy were to become more goal oriented it would have to address the Army's overall mission with more specific reference to the people involved, and something about combat.

Such a statement of Chaplaincy Mission might then read;

"The mission of the Army Chaplaincy is to bring U.S. Army personnel into a relationship with God, and God with them, so as to enable them to fight and win in times of combat."

Switching to a Management System where Chaplains owned their ministry, managed it, and were held accountable for it's contributions to the overall mission of the Army would mean switching to a Management by Objectives System from the highest to the lowest levels of the Chaplaincy.

What if the Army Chaplaincy began to think about it's organization as well as the Army's mission and purpose in terms of both of their overall purposes.

Next, what if these purposes were then harmonized and reduced to accomplishable and measurable goals.

Finally, what if key individuals after being given these accomplishable and measurable goals were asked to write objectives as to how they were going to accomplish these goals.

What would happen to the Army Chaplaincy?

First, the purposes and goals of the Army Chaplaincy would become more clearly defined. Secondly, the conception would grow that these goals and purposes are the way the organization should move.

Third, a commitment would be made to these goals and purposes from the top of the organization down. Last of all these goals and purposes would serve both as a motivation of performance as well as the basic criteria for the evaluation of the Chaplain and his ministry.

### III. AN ANECDOTE

During World War II, General George Patton had a staff Chaplain who was called in and told of the need for a break in the weather to permit the successful prosecution of the battle.<sup>5</sup>

The Chaplain was then ordered to do something about the problem. The Chaplain, bogged down in the tasks of his functional ministry, tried to use the excuse that only God was responsible for the weather, and only God could change it.

General Patton agreed with both statements but still ordered the Chaplain to go and compose a prayer to accomplish that purpose. The Chaplain obeyed with tongue in cheek. The result was a prayer that accomplished the purpose. A change in the weather occurred.

Many theological explanations or conclusions could be drawn from this anecdote. I will offer mine. An analysis of that incident from the rationale of this paper would conclude that the Chaplain in the story was operating according to a system of Management by Tasks or Function. His mind and body were operating on that wavelength and frequency.

It was not the Chaplain's task or even his function to pray about the weather. That was God's concern, and his General's concern. But evidently General Patton needed all the help he could muster to accomplish his mission. And no one could help him but God and his Chaplain.

So for a short period of time the Chaplain began to operate according to a Management by Objectives philosophy. The Chaplain's goals and the General's goals were very much the same for a brief number of hours.

My point is this. What would happen if such a norm and standard became the SOP of the Chaplaincy Corps, as well as that of the Army? What would be the results? The results might be just as dramatic in times of peace as in times of war.

#### IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has pointed out that the present management system for Chaplains appears to be more task and function oriented than mission or goal oriented. It is geared more to the internal needs of the Army than to its overall mission.

In such a system of Chaplaincy Management the Chaplain's program and ministry is not really owned by the Chaplain, but rather by his Commander.

Under the present system of management, the overall mission of the Army, and of the Chaplaincy, are not very closely aligned. The Chaplaincy missional statement makes no mention of the primary mission of the Army.



Finally, there is no accurate way to assess how much or how little the Chaplain's ministry is contributing to the Army's overall mission capabilities.

Thus, we could conclude that the present utilization of the Chaplain may not be in the best interests of the Army with regard to it's overall mission, nor to the Army Chaplaincy.

While utilizing the Chaplain in a functional capacity may offer more flexibility in his usage, it appears such a management system only partially fulfills and meets the Army's missional needs.

Therefore, this paper recommends first; that more study and evaluation be given to the present system of Chaplaincy Management as it relates to the overall mission of the Army.

Secondly, that Management By Objectives not be implemented as a mixed bag with Management by Function as with the present system.

Finally, that Management by Objectives be implemented as a total system at all levels of the Army Chaplaincy.

## V. FOOTNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Ronald S. Pezanson, Jr., "The MBOR Process Within The Army Chaplaincy," (Unpublished paper presented to U.S. Army Chaplains at Ft. Wadsworth, Staten Island, New York, 1977), p. 1

2 Ted W. Engstrom and Edward R. Dayton, The Art of Management for Christian Leaders (Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1976), pp. 85-86.

3 Ibid., p. 83-84

4 "Duties of Chaplains and Commanders' Responsibilities," 1979, Army Regulation No 165-20 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1979), p. 1-1

5 "Patton," (Adopted from a scene in the movie on the life and exploits of General George S. Patton during World War II.)

"Army Management Doctrine" 1973, Army Regulation No. 5-1 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1973).

"Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Activities and Training," 1978, (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1977).